

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

DITECH FINANCIAL, LLC, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

ANTELOPE HOMEOWNERS'
ASSOCIATION, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-cv-02029-RFB-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 54)

15 On October 18, 2017, the Court ordered Defendant Leodegario D. Salvador d/b/a GDS Financial
16 to retain an attorney by November 8, 2017. Docket No. 49. On October 27, 2017, Defendant filed a
17 response to the Court's order, arguing that it is not required to obtain an attorney as an individual doing
18 business as a corporate entity. Docket No. 54. The Court construes this filing as a motion for
19 reconsideration on the basis of legal error or manifest injustice. *See* Local Rule 59-1(a). As the Court's
20 prior order identified, Docket No. 49 at 1, several courts have similarly held that an individual doing
21 business as a corporate entity must obtain counsel, *see Lance v. Adams*, 2011 WL 1813061, at *3 (E.D.
22 Cal. May 6, 2011) (refusing to allow plaintiff to proceed *pro se* individual doing business as a corporate
23 entity); *see also Sobayo v. Caliber Home Loans, Inc.*, 2016 WL 6277233, at *1, 4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 27,
24 2016) (same); *J&J Sports Prods., Inc. v. De La Cerda*, 2013 WL 1091697, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 14,
25 2013) (ordering defendants sued in both their individual capacities and as individuals doing business as
26 a corporate entity to obtain licensed counsel). Defendant's motion to reconsider cites no legal authority
27 making a contrary holding. The Court is not persuaded that it committed legal error in requiring
28 Defendant to retain licensed counsel and is not persuaded that there is manifest injustice.

1 Accordingly, the motion to reconsider is hereby **DENIED**.

2 IT IS SO ORDERED.

3 DATED: October 30, 2017

4 
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge